REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-21 remain pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 being the independent claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-2 and 4-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0143529 (hereinafter referred to as "Schmid") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,708,885 (hereinafter referred to as "Beutnagel") and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0223042 (hereinafter referred to as "Evans"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since Schmid, Beutnagel and Evans, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of independent claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 and their respective dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 19-21 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 include a similar feature of: wherein the generic and non-generic words that are part of a particular application are assigned a higher confidence level than the generic and non-generic words that are not part of the particular application. Examiner acknowledges that Schmid in view of Beutnagel does not teach this claimed feature.

In support of the rejection as applied to this claimed feature, the Examiner added Evans (col. 3, paragraphs 0028-0031 and col. 4, paragraph 0039). Evans discusses, at col. 3, paragraph 0028, dragging and dropping a database onto a GUI palette that automatically

displays a dialog box associated with the selected database, where the purpose of the dialog box is to quickly and conveniently provide the user of the GUI with a quantitative measure of the source database. Evan discusses, at col. 3, paragraph 0029, different types of databases, including relational and text databases and some combination of the two types. Evan discusses, at col. 3, paragraph 0030, an example database in Figure 2 that is not strictly a relational or text database, but is a database that consists of a series of individual documents each of which has an identifying number associated with a text field. Evan further discusses in paragraph 0030 that this type of database has been processed so as to make searching large numbers of such documents faster and more efficient. Evan discusses, at col. 3, paragraph 0030 and paragraph 0031, how various resources are extracted from the various types of databases (including national language grammar rules when the database is a relational database).

Applicants assert that none of the above discussed by Evans teaches or suggests the claimed feature of <u>assigning a higher confidence value based on whether the generic and non-generic words are part of the particular application</u>. Applicants reviewed Evans in its entirety and believe that Evans does not teach or suggest this claimed feature. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Schmid, Beutnagel and Evans, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest every feature of the claimed invention. For at least this reason, independent claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 and their respective dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 19-21 are distinguishable from Schmid, Beutnagel and Evans, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-0931

if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been

properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Thus, Applicants believe that the

present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicants respectfully request

reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this

application.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: October 13, 2006   /Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126
                                                            Molly A. McCall
                                                            (703) 633-0931

P10364 response to fourth non-final OA